



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BRIEF MENTION.

In his excellent *Essai sur la rhétorique grecque* M. Navarre makes a strong plea for the rehabilitation of rhetoric, which, according to his report, is fallen into unmerited neglect in Modern France (A. J. P. XXI 472). A similar plea was made some years ago by M. d' Haussonville in a critique of George Sand quoted in my *Essays and Studies* (p. 50): Les préceptes de rhétorique, he says, qui ont cours dans nos écoles ne diffèrent pas de ceux que la jeunesse studieuse recueillait autrefois sous les portiques d'Athènes et de Rome. Celui qui fait un jeu de ces préceptes et qui ne sait discerner l'éternelle vérité cachée sous leurs formules arides pourra peut-être surprendre un succès d'un jour; mais il s'exposera à voir couler tôt ou tard sa réputation fragile, comme un édifice dont l'architecte aura embelli la façade sans en asseoir la base d'après les lois de l'équilibre géométrique. No one can be surprised at these pleas, these warnings, who knows how much the sanity of French prose is due to rhetorical studies. With the new era the old charm will disappear. On the one hand, we shall have, nay, we have, utter carelessness, on the other, sublimated symbolism. And if rhetoric is neglected in France, what shall we say of the scant attention it has received in Anglo-Saxon countries? In the classical domain Mr. Sandys has done some good work, and it is to me a welcome sign of the times that Mr. ROBERTS has attracted so much attention and gained so much reputation by his admirable editions of the *περὶ ὕψους* (A. J. P. XX 228), and of the *Three Literary Letters of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, to which he has now added *Demetrius On Style* (Cambridge University Press). To be sure, the author of the *περὶ ὕψους*, the so-called Longinus, has never lost his hold on the modern world. He is a critic of exceptional delicacy of feeling and breadth of sympathy; and while the work may be rooted in antique rhetoric, its foliage and its flowers seem to belong to our world, and we can hardly realize that we are separated from him by the whole width of the Christian centuries. Dionysios, on the other hand, is no sooner set up than he is bowled over. Blass, who has done so much to bring him back into notice, has actually suffered by reason of his championship; and almost everybody that deals with him seems to be afraid of being suspected of spiritual affinity with the schoolmasterly critic. Usener classes him among the *magistelli* and Norden vilipends him, so that I am glad to see how stoutly Mr. ROBERTS stands by him with Mr. Saintsbury as an *ἐφεδρος* in time of need. For my part, Dionysios

accompanies me during three out of the four years of my cycle, and, while he is not exactly the man of my counsel, he is assuredly indispensable for any serious study of Attic oratory. If he is narrowminded in his judgment of Plato and Thukydides, that very narrowness shows us how potent rhetoric was in every sphere of antique literature; and in the matter of Thukydides, I am free to confess that I would rather consider the great historian a perverse genius, as Dionysios has done, than look upon him as a Laokoon, struggling with the twin serpents of diction and syntax, which had not yet been tamed to the docility of Aesculapian snakes (A. J. P. XIV 397, Shorey, Tr. A. P. A. XXIV, 1893, p. 82.)

---

As for Demetrios, nothing could be more timely than the revival of his admirable manual; for though Mr. ROBERTS is kind enough to say that rhetoric is not neglected in the United States of America, the cultivation of it must be very recent. It is not so very long since James Russell Lowell said: 'If I have attained to any clearness of style, I think it is partly due to my having had to lecture twenty years as a professor at Harvard. It was always present to my consciousness that whatever I said must be understood at once by my hearers or never. Out of this, I, almost without knowing it, formulated the rule that every sentence must be clear in itself and never too long to be carried, without risk of losing its balance, on a single breath of the speaker'. In other words, he formulated a rule that he might have learned in advance from Cicero,<sup>1</sup> from Dionysios,<sup>2</sup> who gives the *πνεῦμα τέλειον ἀνδρός* as the measure of the period. No wonder that one hails with satisfaction the prospect of a new edition of the *De Compositione* by so competent a hand as Mr. ROBERTS, if indeed we may construe his suggestion as a promise. So, too, if Oliver Wendell Holmes, that other great light of American literature, had read Dionysios, he would not have written in so tentative a fashion of 'the pneumatic or rather pneumonic character of rhythm'. *Homo mensura* is written all over our tables of weights and measures; the lungs are the windgauge of style. But Lowell and Holmes are classics and Apollo saved them. But Apollo will not always save. If there is an elementary rule in what the ancients called composition, it is that prose rhythm and poetical rhythm must be kept apart. All classical scholars know the rule. All French stylists insist on it. Everybody remembers how absurd Buffon made himself with his quatrain on the horse; though perhaps everyone that quotes 'un poète mort jeune à qui l'homme survit' does not remember the gentle rebuke that De Musset gave Ste.-Beuve. 'Tu l'as bien dit, ami, mais tu l'as trop bien dit'. Dryden's prose is admirable, but, as Mr.

<sup>1</sup> E. g. De Oratore III 182.

<sup>2</sup> De Compositione c. 23, p. 171 (R.)

Pater says, he will fall into verse, whereas Wordsworth never does, according to the same authority, and Dickens's bad blank verse is a stock illustration. And yet, despite this simple rule, a much-admired American writer of our day has actually reeled off hundreds, if not thousands of more or less perfect decasyllabic verses under the delusion that he was translating Homer into rhythmical prose. And sometimes I cannot help thinking that it would be better if our classical scholars themselves had read something more of Quintilian than the first chapter of the Tenth Book, to which most of them seem to confine their attention. Perhaps we might have been spared the theory that every Latin sentence is constructed on the principle of a *diminuendo* toot; perhaps we might have been spared the revolt against Quintilian's doctrine (Inst. Or. IX 4, 26) that makes the verb the file-closer. In this whole range of studies, we must be content still to acknowledge the ancients as our masters. There is no appeal from the ear.

---

Mr. ROBERTS's Introduction gives us a sketch of the Greek study of style. To one who knows his Rhetores Graeci, his Gerber, his Blass, his Norden, the sketch seems rather too sketchy, but Mr. ROBERTS dedicates his book 'Iuventuti lucide scribendi ac venuste studiosae', and his χειραγωγή is meant for those who have yet to learn that there is such a thing as a serious study of style. And even those who are more or less familiar with the subject will be delighted with the skill and the grace of the exposition. As a translator, Mr. ROBERTS has gained high repute by his previous renderings but in the matter of translation I am prone to be a devil's advocate; and as I have not compared Mr. ROBERTS's version with the original word for word, I am not prepared to say that he has solved all the problems that the translation of any Greek work on rhetoric brings up. The task, as I know from experience, is one of great difficulty. The ordinary dictionaries are of little help, and the special vocabularies often leave one in the lurch. The latest guide is not always the most trustworthy, and old Ernesti is frequently better than more recent Volkmann. This lack of lexical resource lends especial value to the Glossary which Mr. ROBERTS has appended and which has enabled him to reduce the volume of his notes. An important feature of these notes is the number of illustrations drawn from English literature; for nothing is better calculated to carry conviction to the mind of the student than just such cogent exemplifications of the universality of rhetorical canons. For these illustrations Mr. ROBERTS acknowledges his obligations to Mr. WAY, who has won such renown by his poetical rendering of Euripides; and it is to Mr. WAY that Mr. ROBERTS owes also the versions of the poetical

citations and a number of valuable suggestions in the translation of the text.<sup>1</sup>

---

This notice has already run beyond the bounds of *Brief Mention*, and yet I have said little about the original text, about the 'goldene Schrift des Demetrios *περὶ ἑρμηνείας*', as Wilamowitz justly calls it. As Milton puts 'Phalereus' next to Plato and Aristotle, I am content to leave him at the bidding of so excellent a judge in such excellent company. The book might be called a Rhetorical Testament, and a certain Biblical authority has been given to it by the short paragraphs into which it has been cut up by the old editor Victorius; and I am not surprised that Mr. ROBERTS recalls, by way of contrast, a like performance attributed to Robert Estienne. The canons of Demetrios are sharp, clear, sensible. The illustrative passages are really illustrative and have saved for us many gems from the lost literature. In one of his commandments Demetrios warns against the multiplication of metaphor lest 'we find ourselves writing dithyrambic poetry instead of prose'. This is what we always tell other people. This is what we think very fine in Paul Louis Courier's 'Dieu, délivre nous du malin et du langage figuré'. But for all that, Demetrios is not averse to figurative language. The rhetoricians were teachers, and being teachers, knew the value of metaphor and simile, which lend wings to the seeds of doctrine, and which plant them in the field of the ear, if I may use a figure that underlies the *purgatas aures* of that 'crabbed coxcomb', Persius.

<sup>1</sup> As I go to press I see that in the last number of the *Classical Review* (Feb. 1903), Dr. RUTHERFORD has made a savage assault on Mr. ROBERTS's edition. Dr. RUTHERFORD's peculiar acerbity always stirs sympathy with the victim of his taws. How different the tone of Henri Weil's review of Dr. RUTHERFORD's *Herondas* in the *Journal des Savants* for Nov., 1891. It is quite as effective as Dr. RUTHERFORD's scolding and yet it is radiant with the charm of a *iucunda senectus*. But instead of imitating the *mite ingenium* of the dean of French Hellenists, the critic seems to have had his perfervid genius still further heated by the example of Roemer's review of his *Scholía Aristophanica*; and Mr. ROBERTS has suffered in consequence. Why, if I were disposed to make trouble, I myself might air one grievance I have against Mr. ROBERTS. In c. 213 Mr. ROBERTS translates the *οἱ ἐμὲ ἐσώθης* of Ktesias by 'You were saved through me', and this is the very example that I selected in my S. C. G. § 163 for the rendering 'Thanks to'. But I recognize the fact that it is hard to get rid of the equation *διά* c. acc. = *διά* c. gen., nay, impossible to quell *τὴν ἀμφίκρανον καὶ παλιμβλαστὴν κῆνα* (A. J. P. XI 372). Dem. 6, 45: *οἱ οὗς* is not *οἱ ὦν*, despite Sandys, and Lys. 26, 9: *οἱ οὗς* is 'Thanks to whom'. Even in such Greek as the Life of Aesop, which Wilamowitz has actually used for his 'Lesebuch', to the horror of straitlaced Hellenists, the distinction is carefully observed. Cf. Vit. Aesop. c. 12 (p. 259 Eberh.), *οὕτως ἐμεινεν ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας οἱ* Αἰσώπου ὡς καὶ *οἱ ἐκείνον ἀπῆρε*.

RADERMACHER's *Demetrius* *περὶ ἑρμηνείας* (Teubner) was published only a few months before ROBERTS'S, and the English editor's work was virtually finished, so that he could make little use of his predecessor. But the Demetrios of Bangor and the Demetrios of Bonn are constructed on very different lines. ROBERTS writes for the general student; RADERMACHER, the able adjutant of USENER in his work on Dionysios, has the professional in view, and the two editions supplement each other. Both editors agree in rejecting the authorship of Demetrius Phalereus, which has few supporters nowadays, but ROBERTS gives a wider margin than RADERMACHER and takes in the first century before and the first century after Christ. RADERMACHER finds a terminus in the word *σκαφίτης* (c. 97), which occurs for the first and only time in Strabo, XVII, p. 817; and he thinks it impossible that Demetrios should be earlier than the first century after Christ. Demetrios, according to him, is untouched by the puristic spirit, and in language he is nearer to Plutarch than he is to Lucian. At my time of life I do not believe in impressionistic criticism, but I should not be grieved if someone shall make out a strong case for a somewhat earlier date. But to tell the truth, Demetrios's use of Aristotle pulls me one way, his admiration of Xenophon another.

---

RADERMACHER gives more scope to syntactical observations than does ROBERTS, and as I took RADERMACHER in hand after I read ROBERTS, I am naturally pleased to note here and there coincidences of judgment. So I was much surprised to find that ROBERTS was superstitious enough to retain, c. 269, the MS reading *εἰ συναφθῇ*. Any attentive reader must have noticed that Demetrios has a way of using *εἰ* + optative in the protasis and the future in the apodosis, and RADERMACHER has rightly put *εἰ συναφθείη* in the text. The optative was doomed, but it made a brave fight before it died, and though the ideal condition is very steady in classical times, the future indicative is occasionally found in apodosis from Homer, Il. 10, 222, down. Another *εἰ* with subjunctive occurs in c. 76, *οὐδὲν οὖν θαυμαστόν, εἰ . . . γένηται*, where both editors follow the MS, but as *θαυμαστόν* . . . *εἰ* normally takes the indicative, I should write without much hesitation *γίνεται*, though Roshdestwenski's *γενήσεται* is sufficiently plausible. In c. 5, ROBERTS follows Victorius and the other editors in reading *οὐκ ἂν . . . γράψειεν* instead of *οὐκ ἂν . . . γράψει ἐν*, which RADERMACHER defends. Now, as I have said, S. C. G., § 432, the future indicative with *ἂν* is theoretically a legitimate construction and is not to be excluded from later Greek, but in my judgment Demetrios is not late enough for that. As for the combination of aorist and perfect, on which RADERMACHER has a long note (p. 84) *ἀ πρόφος* of *ἔρχεν* . . . *καὶ*

μεμίμηται (c. 72), I cannot grant that the earlier usage gave any real hold to the later Latinism; and there is considerable confusion in the other long note on the periphrastic use of the present participle (p. 116). See my S. C. G., §§ 191, 291. Both editors read, c. 170, μόλις ἂν ἀναγνῶ. This ἀναγνῶ Jannaris (p. 564) takes to be subjunctive for optative. RADERMACHER (p. 68) says that ἂν is for ἐάν, but the translation is exceedingly awkward, and I should read ἀναγνοίη with as little hesitation as he reads c. 215, < ἂν > αὐτὸν καλοίη, where ROBERTS sticks to the MS. There is great confusion in later times between certain forms of subjunctive and optative.

---

But not to dwell unduly on these minor matters, there is one point that deserves development. In c. 155: πείθων δωρεῖσθαι Σεύθει δ < τι > τις ἔχοι there is really no difficulty, as πείθων carries with it the notion of ἐπειθε; but this leads RADERMACHER to the further discussion of the optative in combination with the generic present; and that is a subject about which I wish to say a few words. In my S. C. G., § 400, I call attention to the parallelism of the optative with the infinitive, and emphasize the use of the optative in complementary clauses. Leaving out δς (δοτις) with the indicative, which is either particular or generic, to use the accepted terms, there are three forms of the generic relative used in combination with the universal present, which is really the thing that makes them generic, δς with subjunctive, which is the regular epic use, δς ἂν, which is the regular prose use, and δς with the optative, which belongs to an early period of the language and goes with the infinitive as its complement. The examples in poetry are too numerous not to have attracted attention long ago. The classical instance is So. Antig. 666: ἀλλ' ὃν πόλις στήσσει, τοῦδε χρὴ κλύειν, which Sophokles puts into the mouth of the Tory Kreon, the stickler for the rights of the throne, for the doctrine of implicit obedience to the head of the state. The tone is that of a proverb or a quotation from the Bible. In prose Xenophon seems to be the only author that is much given to it, but that is not surprising, for Xenophon has preserved many old-fashioned things. It is nearly fifty years since my attention was called to this special point by Hertlein's edition of the Cyropaedia (1853), in which he emphasizes the matter at I, 6, 19; and Goodwin's Xenophontean examples, MT. § 555, coincide largely with what Hertlein has in his edition of 1859. No example seems to occur in the Anabasis, and the construction is rare, after all, among the classics outside of Xenophon. Plato, Lysis, 207 E, cited by Radermacher, is in my collection. Gorgias, 482 B, is not squarely met by the commentators, and the Ps.-Platonic Riv., 133 B, while clear enough, will not be allowed to count as a classical example. But how are we to explain the construction?

Goodwin accounts for the deviation from the standard prose use on the ground of an equivalence of the leading verb and the infinitive to optative and *άν*. So in the Sophoklean passage, if *χρή κλύειν* = *κλύοις άν*, or, as Goodwin puts it, *δικαίως άν κλύοις*, then *στήσειε* ceases to be irregular. The explanation is ingenious and has, I believe, found wide acceptance, and yet to me it is not convincing. It is more like a mathematical formula than a linguistic process. *χρή* + infinitive = imperative, but optative + *άν* = imperative, ∴ *χρή* + infinitive = optative + *άν*. Optative + *άν* = imperative takes the subjunctive sequence (A. J. P. VI 69). *χρή* + infinitive = imperative = optative + *άν* takes the optative sequence. 'A fair exchange is no robbery'. Q. E. D. But language is eminently unfair, and while optative + *άν* is often felt as imperative, the imperative is not so readily felt as optative + *άν*. Jebb says, 'The optative puts the case in the most general way. Hence <it> suits proverbs'. But wherein is it more general than *ός άν στήσῃ*? Humphreys calls it the ideal condition. True, but that is only saying that it is an optative. It is used in proverbs, not because it is generic, because the generic element is represented by the leading verb, but because it is archaic, as Earle correctly says in his O. T., 314. There is, as I have stated in my S. C. G. (§ 399), a certain affinity between *ή άπαρέμφατος έγκλισις*, as the Greek calls it, and *ή εύκτική*, between the pure idea of the verb and the pure ideal of the mood. Where we find it in classic Greek this particular optative is atavistic, and when the later Greek was holding grimly on to the optative, no wonder that he was delighted to follow such a model as Xenophon, and the construction was considered not a Latinism but a lovely Atticism (cf. A. J. P. IV 428, XXIII 130).

---

One more note before I tear myself away from fascinating Demetrios and his fascinating editors. In c. 302 we read: *ό της Τιμάνδρας κατηγορών ός πεπορνευκίας, την λεκανίδα και τους όβολους και την ψίαθον και πολλήν τινα τοιαύτην δυσφημίαν έταιρών κατήρασεν του δικαστηρίου*. For *όβολους* Wilamowitz, *lepidum caput*, writes *όλισβους*, and at first I was disposed to surrender. But something is to be said for *όβολους*. The *όλισβος*, the *βανβών* of Herondas 6, 18, was a *σκυτινη έπικουρία*, a 'leathern convenience', as I have ventured to translate it after Mrs. Centlivre (A. J. P. XIV 261), and belonged to the *mundus muliebris* of grass widows and lone females (Ar., Lys., 109, 110), rather than to the apparatus of a πόρνη. Now Timandra was a grand lady among the hetaerae, as anyone can see for himself by consulting the dictionaries; and her unknown assailant is reducing her to the rank of a common strumpet, of whom Philemon says: *εις όβολός' εισπηδησάτω*. The *λεκανίς* I take to be the basin for collecting tribute, and the *ψίαθος* is only too familiar from Ar., Lys., 921, 925. The subject is not



a dainty one, but Wilamowitz has no more reason to blush for his conjecture than the Rev. Dr. Bentley had to blush for some of his, e. g. Philemon fr. 4, 12 (4, 4 M); and I hope that I shall be forgiven in my turn for upholding, however feebly, the more decent tradition.

---

The limited space of the Journal precludes a systematic review of schoolbook literature, and I do not purpose to give a detailed account of the *Collezione di classici greci e latini con note italiane*, published by LOESCHER of Turin. But I hold it to be of importance to the Anglo-Saxon mind that we look on things through what is called nowadays the 'Romanic' medium; and apart from the substantial value of the work itself, which is not to be underrated, the recent development of Greek scholarship in Italy is an interesting phenomenon. Even the Germans are beginning to find that their Ausonian as well as their American disciples are putting forth an independent life that must be reckoned with. The Italians have learned from the Germans the cult of the 'literature', so-called. An Italian book, published in 1902, incorporates, if possible, everything up to the end of 1901. And their commentaries are modern. There is a refreshing absence for the most part of references to grammars. There is no unnecessary display of erudition. Difficulties are solved by translations, too frequently, as it would seem to old-fashioned teachers, but one must recognize the spirit of the times; and I repent me of what I said of REITER'S *Iphigenie auf Tauris* (XXI 112), my notice of which was one of the few discords in the chorus of praises. The editors of this Italian series are well equipped for the work and some of them are known everywhere. No student of Pindar but respects FRACCAROLI, and FRACCAROLI has contributed to the series a revision of FERRARI'S *Lisia*. It is a pleasant coincidence that Rauchenstein, the editor of Lysias, was a lover of Pindar and taught others to love him. No wonder. The contrast enhances the joy. ZURETTI, another contributor, is an Homeric scholar, who has made himself felt; but it would be invidious to select names from the long list of editors, and my chief object in this *Brief Mention* is to emphasize my pleasure that the land to which we owe the renaissance of Greek studies is asserting itself again, ἄγχι καρποφόροις ἀρούραισιν αἶτ' ἀμειβόμενοι | τόκα μὲν ὄν βίον ἀνδράσιν ἐπηγετὰν ἐκ πεδίων ἔδοσαν, | τόκα δ' αὖτ' ἀναπανσάμεναι σθένος ἔμαρψαν.

---

It is always invidious to quote from oneself but I cannot forbear recalling with a certain patriotic satisfaction that a quarter of a century ago, I urged as one of the needs of the time for classical study 'a resolute purpose to make an honorable position for the

American people in this department of thought and culture as in others' (*Essays and Studies* p. 84). That resolute purpose has not been lacking. What we have accomplished during the last twenty-five years in the realm of linguistics and philology, this is not the place to record, but surely what we have done in archaeology has been a surprise even to those who have wished the best things and hoped the best things for American initiative; and no one can read Professor SEYMOUR's account of the *First Twenty Years of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* without rejoicing that we have so much to our credit. Of three most important archaeological works on the editor's table two are due to the American Institute, one to American munificence. The first is the *Argive Heraeum* by CHARLES WALDSTEIN, with the coöperation of CHASE, DE COU, HERMAN, HOPPIN, LYTHGOE, NORTON, RICHARDSON and WHEELER. The second is the long promised work on the *Investigations at Assos*. Neither of these works is complete and the editor has not yet succeeded in securing a competent reviewer for the *Argive Heraeum* outside of the inner circle. A *Selbstanzeige* is not a popular form of criticism in America. A competent reviewer has been found for the Assos volume, but the eminent scholar who has promised his help has promised it on the condition that the review, which is to be a thorough one, take in the whole work. The wheels of the Assos archaeologists move slowly and the review may be one of the glories of the Journal when the present editor has ceased from troubling readers and contributors. Of the *Tebtunis Papyri* Part I ed. by GRENFELL, HUNT and SMYLY which is called by the other name *University of California Publications, Graeco-Roman Archaeology*, Vol. I, something ought to be said beyond the recognition of Mrs. Hearst's liberality and something adequate will be said, I trust, ere long.

---

There are to be three volumes of the *Tebtunis Papyri*. The present volume deals with the papyri from the mummies of crocodiles, which belong to the end of the second or to the early part of the first century before Christ. The sheets in which the crocodiles were wrapped had to be of great size, smaller documents being used for padding. The Egyptologist may congratulate himself on the wealth of new information provided regarding the internal history of Egypt under the later Ptolemies. But to the average man, one might say the average scholar, there is a sad lack of human interest in that formidable array of documents, which remind one of nothing so much as the German mania for reports of every kind. Only two per cent of the crocodiles yielded papyri. Not two per cent of the papyri yield anything that vies remotely in interest with the famous Erotic Fragment that is ever to be associated with the name

of Grenfell. To be sure, there is a cry of Helen, forsaken of Menelaos, that gives a new phase of her story, and strikes the old passionate erotic note of entreaty. ὁ φανεῖς χάρις μοι haunts one like 'Da mihi hoc, mel meum'. There is a long descriptive passage of warbling birds and busy bees, such as would have roused the merriment of Aristophanes. There are one or two reflections on love, not remarkable for novelty, and there is the legacy of a bardash, which the editors have rendered into Latin, a language that does not blush. One of the four epigrams is already extant and the papyrus gives a better reading. Of the others we can barely guess at the drift, and there is not much to be got out of the lacunose fragment of the second book of the Iliad, though there is something, as Mr. ALLEN has shown (Cl. R., Feb., 1903). But there are Royal Ordinances. There is Official Correspondence, one of the choice bits of which conveys minute instructions for the entertainment of a Roman Senator. There are Petitions. There is an elaborate Land Survey, a Tax List, and a number of Contracts, the most interesting of which is a marriage contract, in which the man seems to be tied up tighter than the woman. Most of the petitions are addressed to an ungrammatical komogrammateus, Menches by name, and charges of assault and robbery seem to have been rife in the crocodile nome. Of the accounts, the one that attracts the modern soul most is that of a dining club. 'The cost per head was 100 drachmae exclusive of wine, which is reckoned separately, as are also bread and garlands'. The corpse must have had a fine περιδαιπνον. In all these Tebtunis documents there is comparatively little wine to an intolerable deal of artabae of wheat. And though the Egyptians were much given to beer, beer does not figure to any extent. This suppression of beer destroys the likeness to Germany, evoked by the 'Akten' and the 'Dorfschulze'.

---

The delay in the transmission of proofs has brought the issue of the present number into the Easter holidays; and this Easter reminds me of an Easter fifty years ago when I found my master and friend, Schneidewin, rejoicing over the resurrection of Hyperides. 'Ex longo tempore', he says, 'nullum diem laetorem mihi vide<0>r egisse quam eum quo praeclarum hoc Attici eloquii exemplum in manus sumere et plenis haustibus combibere licuit.' In like manner our American Easter of 1903 has been made memorable to Cis-Atlantic Hellenists by the arrival of WILAMOWITZ'S *Perser des Timotheos* (Lemcke and Büchner). There are only 250 verses, it is true; but, as WILAMOWITZ observes, 'historically the 250 verses of Timotheos are worth a hundred times more than 250 new verses of Pindar or Sophokles, no matter how far below the latter they may be in absolute value.'

We have now for the first time a clear conception not only of the character of the poet but of the class of poetry. The cynic may remark that it would have been better for the fame of Timotheos, if he had not been brought to life without his lyre, but the historian of literature is greatly the gainer, and the gain is indefinitely enhanced by the illuminating comment of the eminent editor. It is a pity that he cannot enlighten without scorching. Nothing seems to abate the strenuousness with which he wields that 'horribile flagellum' which has fallen for so many years impartially on the backs of great and small in the world of scholars. Of course, in a provisional edition like this there must be abundant room for reconsideration, to say nothing of typographical errors and incredible hastinesses. But the main features stand out with absolute distinctness and it is a pleasure to study this strange monument, undisturbed by the avalanche of conjecture and commentary that will be precipitated on us before long.

---

W. P. M.: The Tennyson Memoir, vol. I, p. 7, quotes a remark made by the poet in his later years with reference to his school-days at Louth: "How I did hate that school! The only good I ever got from it was the memory of the words 'sonus desilientis aquae', and of an old wall covered with wild weeds opposite the school windows." It is not easy to find this Latin phrase in any classical author. Probably it is merely an inaccurate quotation from memory from Ovid's story of the Rape of Persephone, *Fasti*, IV 428:

Valle sub umbrosa locus est aspergine multa  
Uvidus ex alto desilientis aquae.

From the preceding page of the Memoir we know that Tennyson studied Ovid while he was at Louth, and it is very likely that his school edition included this passage. In support of this guess I may add that in two other passages of the Memoir we find the late Laureate misquoting from memory the classics which he knew so well (II 239, and I 140). In a letter to Mr. Gladstone (1880) he speaks of the lovely lines of Catullus, "Multas per terras et multa per aequora vectus," etc., meaning, of course, the "Multas per gentes," etc., of ci 1. And in a letter to James Spedding (1834) he misquotes what Dionysius of Halicarnassus had to say about the qualities of Alcaeus: "I have written several things since I saw you, some emulative of the ἡδὺν καὶ βραχὺν καὶ μεγαλοπρεπὲς of Alcaeus," etc. What Dionysius actually wrote was τὸ μεγαλόφυνες καὶ βραχὺν καὶ ἡδὺν μετὰ δεινότητος (ed. Reiske, vol. V, p. 421).

K. F. S.: Just because memory is such a saucy trickster explains, no doubt, why one is so eager to discover her devious ways, even at one's own peril. So, as one reads Professor Mustard's first comment, one is tempted to follow still further the line of thought suggested. The passage from Ovid appears to betray the fact that all Tennyson really remembered of his 'sonus desilientis aquae' was the last two words. But 'desilientis aquae' is not self-supporting, it needs an associate. The promotion of 'sonus' to that position might have been expected from the author of 'The Brook'. Indeed, it is not without interest to observe that the association is one which belongs to humanity in general. In all periods, the majority of us have been quite as deeply impressed by the sound of running water as by the sight of it. The familiar lines of Theokritos (I, 7-8) were well-known to Tennyson himself and had been especially noted by Leigh Hunt ("Jar of Honey"). The idea of them recurs again and again in antique literature. Compare Vergil, E. V, 83-4; Culex, 17; Horace, Epod., XVI, 48; Od. III, 13, 15-16, etc. Moreover, 'sonus' is a natural inference from the Ovidian lines, and Ovid himself recurs, elsewhere, to the same association of ideas. Compare Amor., III 5, 5,

Area gramineo suberat viridissima prato  
Umida de guttis lene sonantis aquae.

The same cadence returns in Fasti, II 704 and VI 340. See also III 18. 'Sonus', itself, is nowhere found. Perhaps, as Professor Gildersleeve suggests, Tennyson's choice of the word was prompted by a distant echo of Tibullus, I 2, 78,

Nec sonitus placidae ducere posset aquae.